



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/998,092      | 11/30/2001  | Wen-Yin Liu          | MSI-933US           | 4350             |

22801 7590 09/28/2006

LEE & HAYES PLLC  
421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500  
SPOKANE, WA 99201

EXAMINER

TRUONG, CAM Y T

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2162

DATE MAILED: 09/28/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/998,092

Applicant(s)

LIU ET AL.

Examiner

Cam Y T. Truong

Art Unit

2162

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 July 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 24-32 and 46-54 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 24-32 and 46-54 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Applicant has amended claims 1, 24, 46 and 54 in the amendment filed on 7/21/2006. Claims 1-9, 24-32 and 46-54 are pending in this Office Action.

***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-9, 24-32 and 46-54 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

The amended claims are get over the 102 rejection in view of Liddly.

Examiner carefully reviewed the amended claims and rejected claims in the new grounds of rejections.

Applicant argued that the prior arts of record did not the claimed limitation "detecting input from a user, wherein the input corresponds to a present user context, and retrieving information corresponding to one or more media files from a media content source, wherein the information was generated responsive to a user context previous to and different from the present user context".

In response to this applicant's argument, the previous ground(s) of rejections are withdrawn and the new grounds of rejections for claims are discussed in this office action.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 1, 24, 46 and 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Examiner reviewed the specification as provided by the applicant on page 5, line 21 to page 6 line 4. However, in the specification as provided by the applicant on page 5-page 6, was not described the added claimed limitation "wherein the information was generated different from the present user context" in claims 1, 24, 46 and 54, in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1, 2, 5, 24-25, 28, 46, 49 and 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liddy et al (or hereinafter "Liddy") (US 5963940) in view of Emens et al (or hereinafter "Emens") (US 6832218).

As to claim 1, Liddy teaches the claimed limitations:

"detecting input from a user, wherein the input corresponds to a present user context" as (col. 2, lines 48-63; col. 8, lines 1-10);

"analyzing at least a subset of the input" as (col. 28, lines 10-40);

"predicting desired access to one or more media files based on the analysis" as (col. 28, lines 1-40);

"retrieving information corresponding to one or more files from a media content source" as (col. 28, lines 30-40);

"presenting the information to a user for suggested access" as (col. 28, lines 30-40);

"wherein the information was generated different from the present user context" as (figs. 16-17).

Liddy does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "responsive to a user context previous".

Emens teaches if a second user later uses the same search engine to independently search for the same information as the previous user i.e., submits the same query, the second user is also presented with the same list of search results as the previous user (col. 3, lines 45-60).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Emens's teaching of if a second user later uses the same search engine to independently search for the same information as the previous user i.e., submits the same query, the second user is also presented with the same list of search results as the previous user to Liddy's system in order to provide advantage of the time and energy for searching same information from a previous user and further to save time of searching the same information from users.

As to claims 2, 25, Liddy teaches the claimed limitation "wherein the input is text" as (fig. 11).

As to claims 5, 28 and 49, Liddy teaches the claimed limitations:

"wherein analyzing the user input further comprises determining one or more keywords from text" as (col. 2, lines 48-63);

“evaluating the one or more keywords in view of semantic text and user intention and preference patterns, the semantic text comprising previously collected text from a personal media database customized to the user” as provides the system’s interpretation of which terms in the query are deemed to be mandatory and solicits user input. One the user has modified the system’s interpretation of the query, the user invokes the matcher which executed the query against the database. One the documents has retrieved and placed in folders, the user is given an opportunity to modify the retrieval and document display criteria. The system provides techniques for generating sophisticated representations of the contents of both queries and documents in a retrieval system by using natural lingual to represent retrieval texts at the multiple levels e.g., semantic, lexical and syntactic (col. 2, lines 35-45; col. 28, lines 15-30).

As to claim 24, Liddy teaches the same claimed limitation as discussed in claim 54, except Liddy further teaches the claimed limitations:

“detecting user input corresponding to a present user context” as (col. 2, lines 48-63; col. 8, lines 1-10);

“independent of whether the user input is associated with an explicitly query; analyzing at least a subset of the user input in view of semantic text and user intention and preference patterns, the semantic text comprising the at least a subset and previously collected text from a personal media database customized for the user, the previously collected text being semantically related to one or more previous multimedia accesses by the users” as the system also provides the system’s interpretation of which

Art Unit: 2162

terms in the query are deemed to be mandatory and solicits user input. One the user has modified the system's interpretation of the query, the user invokes the matcher which executed the query against the database. One the documents has retrieved and placed in folders, the user is given a change to modify the retrieval and document display criteria. The system provides techniques for generating sophisticated representations of the contents of both queries and documents in a retrieval system by using natural lingual to represent retrieval texts at the multiple levels e.g., semantic, lexical and syntactic (col. 2, lines 35-45; col. 28, lines 15-30).

As to claim 54, Liddy teaches the claimed limitations:

“detecting user input in a present user context” as (col. 2, lines 48-63);

“responsive to detecting the user input and independent of whether the input is associated with an explicitly query” (figs. 11&12, col. 2, lines48-63; col. 28, lines 10-40);

“analyzing the user input” as (col. 28, lines 10-40);

“predicting desired access to one or more media files based on the analysis” as (col. 28, lines 3-40);

“retrieving information corresponding to one or more media files from a media content source” (col. 28, lines 30-40);

“presenting the information as a suggestion” as (col. 28, lines 30-40);

“wherein the information was generated different from the present user context” as (figs. 16-17).



Liddy does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "responsive to a user context previous".

Emens teaches if a second user later uses the same search engine to independently search for the same information as the previous user i.e., submits the same query, the second user is also presented with the same list of search results as the previous user (col. 3, lines 45-60).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Emens's teaching of if a second user later uses the same search engine to independently search for the same information as the previous user i.e., submits the same query, the second user is also presented with the same list of search results as the previous user to Liddy's system in order to provide advantage of the time and energy for searching same information from a previous user and further to save time of searching the same information from users.

As to claim 46, Liddy teaches the same claimed limitation subject matter as discussed in claim 24, except Barr teaches the claimed limitation "a processor, a memory coupled to the processor, the memory comprising computer executable instructions, the processor being configured to fetch and execute the computer-executable instructions for" as (figs. 1&2, col. 5, lines 20-45).

Art Unit: 2162

7. Claims 3, 26 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liddy in view of Emens and further in view of Talati (US 5999942).

As to claims 3, 26 and 47, Barr does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein the user input is text in a word processor document or in an e-mail". Talati teaches A user types in the query "switch to word processor and update the Appage.TM. page "word.veb"", APCS 13 switches to the Word Processor application, selects action update and loads the Appage.TM. page for the document word.web into the word processor attribute window (col. 15, lines 50-55).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Talati's teaching of a user types in the query "switch to word processor and update the Appage.TM. page "word.veb"", APCS 13 switches to the Word Processor application, selects action update and loads the Appage.TM. page for the document word.web into the word processor attribute window to Liddy's system in order to filter viruses or restrict documents containing offensive material by modifying activation actions within the EBCS without modifying Microsoft's Internet Browser.

8. Claims 4, 27, 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liddy in view of Emens and further in view of Balabanovic (6895552)

As to claims 4, 27 and 48, Liddy does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein the information further comprises suggested media content items, the method

further comprising; detecting user interest in an item of the suggested media items" as (fig. 11).

Liddy does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "responsive to detecting the user interest, displaying a high-level feature corresponding to the item, the high-level feature being stored in a database customized to the user". Balabanovic teaches method and apparatus for generating and displaying a visual summarization of a document is described. In one embodiment, a technique described herein extracts visual features from the document and ranks multiple pages of a document based upon at least one or more visual features of the page. The pages may be presented on a graphical user interface (GUI) to a user with features being displayed that are ranked higher (col. 2, lines 1-6).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Balabanovic's teaching of displaying ranked higher features of page to Liddy's system in order to represent documents or other items such that information about a document or item is easily relayed to and understandable by a user.

9. Claims 6-7, 29-30, and 50-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liddy in view of Emens and further in view of Li (US 6480843).

As to claims 6, 29 and 50, Liddy does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein analyzing the user input further comprise evaluating the user input based on lexical features". Li teaches the query is expanded by replacing the query words by

Art Unit: 2162

thereof corresponding higher-level semantic concept and syntactically relationship. To support query expansion, indices of words related by lexical semantics and syntactical relationships, such as co-occurrence, need to be maintained. The indices for related words by lexical semantics can be constructed as a hierarchical structure (col. 7, lines 20-25; col. 2, lines 10-15).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Li's teaching of the query is expanded by replacing the query words by thereof corresponding higher level semantic concept and syntactically relationship. To support query expansion, indices of words related by lexical semantics and syntactical relationships, such as co-occurrence, need to be maintained. The indices for related words by lexical semantics can be constructed as a hierarchical structure to Liddy's system in order to prevent mismatch in information retrieval occurs because people often use different words to describe concepts in their queries than authors use to describe the same concepts in their documents.

As to claims 7, 30 and 51, Liddy does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein analyzing the user input further comprises evaluating the user input based on syntactical features". Li teaches the query is expanded by replacing the query words by corresponding higher-level semantic concept and syntactically relationship. To support query expansion, indices of words related by lexical semantics and syntactical relationships, such as co-occurrence, need to be maintained. The indices for related

Art Unit: 2162

words by lexical semantics can be constructed as a hierarchical structure (col. 7, lines 20-25; col. 2, lines 10-15).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Li's teaching of the query is expanded by replacing the query words by corresponding higher level semantic concept and syntactically relationship. To support query expansion, indices of words related by lexical semantics and syntactical relationships, such as co-occurrence, need to be maintained. The indices for related words by lexical semantics can be constructed as a hierarchical structure to Liddy's system in order to prevent mismatch in information retrieval occurs because people often use different words to describe concepts in their queries than authors use to describe the same concepts in their documents.

10. Claims 8, 31 and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liddy in view of Emens and further in view of Conrad (US 5682539).

As to claims 8, 31 and 52, Liddy does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein analyzing the user input further comprises evaluating the user input based on at least a partially instantiated sentences pattern". Conrad teaches user input sentence is received and a pattern is generated from the words of the input sentence. An algorithm stored in the computer is applied to select which one of the number of general meaning nodes is intended by the user by comparing the input sentence pattern to the typical sentence patterns (Abstract).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Conrad's teaching of user input sentence is received and a pattern is generated from the words of the input sentence. An algorithm stored in the computer is applied to select which one of the number of general meaning nodes is intended by the user by comparing the input sentence pattern to the typical sentence patterns to Liddy's system in order to retrieve the most relevance document corresponding to user's query based on sentence patterns.

11. Claims 9, 32 and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liddy in view of Emens and further in view of Chong (US 6366908)

As to claims 9, 32 and 53 Liddy does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "identifying media content use patterns, and wherein analyzing the user input further comprises evaluating the user input based on the media content use patterns, wherein the suggested access is an insert or attach media content operation".

Chong teaches keyfact-based retrieval method, which extracts precise keyfact patterns included in a natural query of a user using the natural language processing techniques and retrieves documents similar to the query in the keyfact-based index file, is provided (col. 2, lines 15-20).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Chong's teaching of keyfact-based retrieval method, which extracts precise keyfact patterns included in a natural query of a user using the natural language processing techniques and retrieves documents similar to the query in

Art Unit: 2162

the keyfact-based index file, is provided to Liddy's system in order to retrieve the most relevance document corresponding to user's query based on sentence patterns.

12. Claims 1, 2, 5, 24-25, 28, 46, 49 and 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable over Barr et al (or hereinafter "Barr") (US 5873076) in view of Liddy et al (or hereinafter "Liddy") (US 5963940) and Emens.

As to claim 1, Barr teaches the claimed limitations:

"detecting input from a user corresponding to a present user context" as the query is received from a user and a document is selected by the user in response to the received query. The step receiving indicates detecting user query. The user query is represented as user input (col. 7, lines 5-10);

"analyzing at least a subset of the input" as when a user of an information searching/retrieval system enters a search query, the query must be parsed (col. 2, lines 20-25); "predicting desired access to one or more media files based on the analysis" as based on the parsed query, a listing of stored documents relevant to the query is provided to the user. The above information shows that the system accesses to media files to retrieve relevance document for providing to the user. The documents are stored in media files (col. 2, lines 20-25; col. 3, lines 60-67);

"retrieving information corresponding to one or more files from a media content source" as based on the parsed query, a listing of stored documents relevant to the query is provided to the user. The above information shows that the system accesses to media files to retrieve relevance documents for providing to the user. The documents

Art Unit: 2162

are stored in media files corresponding to various publisher sources (col. 2, lines 20-25; col. 8, lines 63-65);

“presenting the information to a user for suggested access” as based on the parsed query, a listing of stored documents relevant to the query is provided to the user. The above information shows that the system accesses to media files to retrieve relevance documents for providing to the user. The documents are stored in media files corresponding to various publisher sources (col. 2, lines 20-25; col. 8, lines 63-65);

“wherein the information was generated different from the present user context” as (fig. 4A).

Barr does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation “independent of whether the input is associated with an explicit query; responsive to a user context previous”.

Liddy teaches the user input is associated with a query as (col. 28, lines 25-27).

Emens teaches if a second user later uses the same search engine to independently search for the same information as the previous user i.e., submits the same query, the second user is also presented with the same list of search results as the previous user (col. 3, lines 45-60).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Liddy’s teaching of the user input is associated with a query Emens’s teaching of if a second user later uses the



same search engine to independently search for the same information as the previous user i.e., submits the same query, the second user is also presented with the same list of search results as the previous user to Liddy's system in order to Barr's system in order to offer the user the ability to interact with the system to confirm and refine the system's interpretation of the query content (col. 2, lines 44-50) and provide advantage of the time and energy for searching same information from a previous user and further to save time of searching the same information from users.

As to claims 2, 25, Barr teaches the claimed limitation "wherein the input is text" as (fig. 4A).

As to claims 5, 28 and 49, Barr teaches the claimed limitation "wherein analyzing the user input further comprises determining one or more keywords from text" as (fig. 4A).

Barr does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "evaluating the one or more keywords in view of semantic text and user intention and preference patterns, the semantic text comprising previously collected text from a personal media database customized to the user".

Liddy teaches the system also provides the system's interpretation of which terms in the query are deemed to be mandatory and solicits user input. One the user

Art Unit: 2162

has modified the system's interpretation of the query, the user invokes the matcher which executed the query against the database. One the documents has retrieved and placed in folders, the user is given an opportunity to modify the retrieval and document display criteria. The system provides techniques for generating sophisticated representations of the contents of both queries and documents in a retrieval system by using natural lingual to represent retrieval texts at the multiple levels e.g., semantic, lexical and syntactic (col. 2, lines 35-45; col. 28, lines 15-30).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Liddy's teaching of provides the system's interpretation of which terms in the query are deemed to be mandatory and solicits user input. One the user has modified the system's interpretation of the query, the user invokes the matcher which executed the query against the database. One the documents has retrieved and placed in folders, the user is given an opportunity to modify the retrieval and document display criteria. The system provides techniques for generating sophisticated representations of the contents of both queries and documents in a retrieval system by using natural lingual to represent retrieval texts at the multiple levels e.g., semantic, lexical and syntactic to Barr's system in order to offer the user the ability to interact with the system to confirm and refine the system's interpretation of the query content (col. 2, lines 44-50).

As to claim 24, Barr teaches the claimed limitation as discussed in claims 1 and 54,

Except Barr does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "independent of whether the user input is associated with an explicitly query; analyzing at least a subset of the user input in view of semantic text and user intention and preference patterns, the semantic text comprising the at least a subset and previously collected text from a personal media database customized for the user, the previously collected text being semantically related to one or more previous multimedia accesses by the users".

Liddy teaches the system also provides the system's interpretation of which terms in the query are deemed to be mandatory and solicits user input. One the user has modified the system's interpretation of the query, the user invokes the matcher which executed the query against the database. One the documents has retrieved and placed in folders, the user is given an change to modify the retrieval and document display criteria. The system provides techniques for generating sophisticated representations of the contents of both queries and documents in a retrieval system by using natural lingual to represent retrieval texts at the multiple levels e.g., semantic, lexical and syntactic (col. 2, lines 35-45; col. 28, lines 15-30).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Liddy's teaching of provides the system's interpretation of which terms in the query are deemed to be mandatory and solicits user input. One the user has modified the system's interpretation of the query, the user invokes the matcher which executed the query against the database. One the documents has retrieved and placed in folders, the user is given an change to modify the retrieval and document display criteria. The system provides techniques for generating sophisticated

Art Unit: 2162

representations of the contents of both queries and documents in a retrieval system by using natural lingual to represent retrieval texts at the multiple levels e.g., semantic, lexical and syntactic to Barr's system in order to offer the user the ability to interact with the system to confirm and refine the system's interpretation of the query content (col. 2, lines 44-50).

As to claim 54, Barr teaches the claimed limitations:

“detecting user input in a present user context” as the query is received from a user and a document is selected by the user in response to the received query. The step receiving indicates detecting user query.

The user query is represented as user input (col. 7, lines 5-10);

“responsive to detecting the user input” as when a user of an information searching/retrieval system enters a search query, the query must be parsed (col. 2, lines 20-25);

“analyzing the user input” as based on the parsed query, a listing of stored documents relevant to the query is provided to the user. The above information shows that the system accesses to media files to retrieve relevance document for providing to the user. The documents are stored in media files (col. 2, lines 20-25; col. 3, lines 60-67);

“predicting desired access to one or more media files based on the analysis” as based on the parsed query, a listing of stored documents relevant to the query is provided to the user. The above information shows that the system

accesses to media files to retrieve relevance document for providing to the user.

The documents are stored in media files (col. 2, lines 20-25; col. 3, lines 60-67);

“retrieving information corresponding to one or more media files from a media content source” as based on the parsed query, a listing of stored documents relevant to the query is provided to the user. The above information shows that the system accesses to media files to retrieve relevance documents for providing to the user. The documents are stored in media files corresponding to various publisher sources (col. 2, lines 20-25; col. 8, lines 63-65);

“presenting the information as a suggestion” as based on the parsed query, a listing of stored documents relevant to the query is provided to the user. The above information shows that the system accesses to media files to retrieve relevance documents for providing to the user. The documents are stored in media files corresponding to various publisher sources (col. 2, lines 20-25; col. 8, lines 63-65);

“responsive to the detecting” as (col. 2, lines 20-25);

“wherein the information was generated different from the present user context” as (fig. 4A).

Barr does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation “independent of whether the input is associated with an explicit query; responsive to a user context previous”.

Liddy teaches the user input is associated with a query as (col. 28, lines 25-27).

Emens teaches if a second user later uses the same search engine to independently search for the same information as the previous user i.e., submits the same query, the second user is also presented with the same list of search results as the previous user (col. 3, lines 45-60).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Liddy's teaching of the user input is associated with a query Emens's teaching of if a second user later uses the same search engine to independently search for the same information as the previous user i.e., submits the same query, the second user is also presented with the same list of search results as the previous user to Liddy's system in order to Barr's system in order to offer the user the ability to interact with the system to confirm and refine the system's interpretation of the query content (col. 2, lines 44-50) and provide advantage of the time and energy for searching same information from a previous user and further to save time of searching the same information from users.

As to claim 46, Barr teaches the same claimed limitation subject matter in claim 24, except Barr teaches the claimed limitation "a processor, a memory coupled to the processor, the memory comprising computer executable instructions, the processor being configured to fetch and execute the computer-executable instructions for" as (fig. 2, col. 7, lines 5-10; col. 2, lines 20-25).

Art Unit: 2162

13. Claims 3, 26 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barr in view of Liddy and Emens and further in view of Talati (US 5999942).

As to claims 3, 26 and 47, Barr does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein the user input is text in a word processor document or in an e-mail". Talati teaches A user types in the query "switch to word processor and update the Appage.TM. page "word.veb"", APCS 13 switches to the Word Processor application, selects action update and loads the Appage.TM. page for the document word.web into the word processor attribute window (col. 15, lines 50-55).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Talati's teaching of a user types in the query "switch to word processor and update the Appage.TM. page "word.veb"", APCS 13 switches to the Word Processor application, selects action update and loads the Appage.TM. page for the document word.web into the word processor attribute window to Barr's system in order to filter viruses or restrict documents containing offensive material by modifying activation actions within the EBCS without modifying Microsoft's Internet Browser.

14. Claims 4, 27, 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barr in view of Liddy and Emens and further in view of Balabanovic (6895552)

As to claims 4, 27 and 48, Barr does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein the information further comprises suggested media content items, the method further comprising; detecting user interest in an item of the suggested media items" as

Art Unit: 2162

displaying a list of documents as suggested media content items and user selects a document of displayed documents, displaying the selected documents based user's selecting that indicates the step detecting user interest in a document of suggested documents (fig. 4).

Barr does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "responsive to detecting the user interest, displaying a high-level feature corresponding to the item, the high-level feature being stored in a database customized to the user". Balabanovic teaches method and apparatus for generating and displaying a visual summarization of a document is described. In one embodiment, a technique described herein extracts visual features from the document and ranks multiple pages of a document based upon at least one or more visual features of the page. The pages may be presented on a graphical user interface (GUI) to a user with features being displayed that are ranked higher (col. 2, lines 1-6).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Balabanovic's teaching of displaying ranked higher features of page to Barr's system in order to represent documents or other items such that information about a document or item is easily relayed to and understandable by a user.

15. Claims 6-7, 29-30, and 50-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barr in view of Liddy and Emens and Li (US 6480843).



As to claims 6, 29 and 50, Barr does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein analyzing the user input further comprise evaluating the user input based on lexical features". Li teaches the query is expanded by replacing the query words by thereof corresponding higher-level semantic concept and syntactically relationship. To support query expansion, indices of words related by lexical semantics and syntactical relationships, such as co-occurrence, need to be maintained. The indices for related words by lexical semantics can be constructed as a hierarchical structure (col. 7, lines 20-25; col. 2, lines 10-15).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Li's teaching of the query is expanded by replacing the query words by thereof corresponding higher level semantic concept and syntactically relationship. To support query expansion, indices of words related by lexical semantics and syntactical relationships, such as co-occurrence, need to be maintained. The indices for related words by lexical semantics can be constructed as a hierarchical structure to Barr's system in order to prevent mismatch in information retrieval occurs because people often use different words to describe concepts in their queries than authors use to describe the same concepts in their documents.

As to claims 7, 30 and 51, Barr does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein analyzing the user input further comprises evaluating the user input based on syntactical features". Li teaches the query is expanded by replacing the query words by corresponding higher-level semantic concept and syntactically relationship. To support

Art Unit: 2162

query expansion, indices of words related by lexical semantics and syntactical relationships, such as co-occurrence, need to be maintained. The indices for related words by lexical semantics can be constructed as a hierarchical structure (col. 7, lines 20-25; col. 2, lines 10-15).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Li's teaching of the query is expanded by replacing the query words by corresponding higher level semantic concept and syntactically relationship. To support query expansion, indices of words related by lexical semantics and syntactical relationships, such as co-occurrence, need to be maintained. The indices for related words by lexical semantics can be constructed as a hierarchical structure to Barr's system in order to prevent mismatch in information retrieval occurs because people often use different words to describe concepts in their queries than authors use to describe the same concepts in their documents.

16. Claims 8, 31 and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barr in view of Liddy and Emens and further in view of Conrad (US 5682539).

As to claims 8, 31 and 52, Barr does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein analyzing the user input further comprises evaluating the user input based on at least a partially instantiated sentences pattern". Conrad teaches user input sentence is received and a pattern is generated from the words of the input sentence. An algorithm stored in the computer is applied to select which one of the number of general

Art Unit: 2162

meaning nodes is intended by the user by comparing the input sentence pattern to the typical sentence patterns (Abstract).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Conrad's teaching of user input sentence is received and a pattern is generated from the words of the input sentence. An algorithm stored in the computer is applied to select which one of the number of general meaning nodes is intended by the user by comparing the input sentence pattern to the typical sentence patterns to Barr's system in order to retrieve the most relevance document corresponding to user's query based on sentence patterns.

17. Claims 9, 32 and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barr in view of Liddy and Emens and further in view of Chong (US 6366908)

As to claims 9, 32 and 53 Barr does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "identifying media content use patterns, and wherein analyzing the user input further comprises evaluating the user input based on the media content use patterns, wherein the suggested access is an insert or attach media content operation".

Chong teaches keyfact-based retrieval method, which extracts precise keyfact patterns included in a natural query of a user using the natural language processing techniques and retrieves documents similar to the query in the keyfact-based index file, is provided (col. 2, lines 15-20).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Chong's teaching of keyfact-based retrieval method,

Art Unit: 2162

which extracts precise keyfact patterns included in a natural query of a user using the natural language processing techniques and retrieves documents similar to the query in the keyfact-based index file, is provided to Barr's system in order to retrieve the most relevance document corresponding to user's query based on sentence patterns.

### ***Conclusion***

18. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure

Turnbull et al (US 7089237).

Art Unit: 2162

**Contact Information**

19. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cam Y T. Truong whose telephone number is (571) 272-4042. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Cam Y Truong  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2162  
9/20/2006